UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.18
14 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Substantive session of 1994

High-level meeting

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 18th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 1 July 1994, at 10 a.m.

President:	Mr. BUTLER	(Australia)
later:	Mr. BOTEZ (Vice-President)	(Romania)

CONTENTS

STATEMENT BY MR. JOSEPH-ANTOINE BELL, SOCCER STAR FROM THE NATIONAL TEAM OF CAMEROON

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

STATEMENT BY MR. JOSEPH-ANTOINE BELL, SOCCER STAR FROM THE NATIONAL TEAM OF CAMEROON

The PRESIDENT said that Mr. Joseph-Antoine Bell, a soccer star from the national team of Cameroon, currently participating in the World Cup event, would speak on behalf of 80 national soccer teams from around the world which had joined the global anti-poverty campaign supported by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The campaign was entitled "A Goal: Human Development".

Mr. JOSEPH-ANTOINE BELL (Soccer star from the national team of Cameroon) said that the mobilization of the world of soccer in support of the global anti-poverty campaign was unprecedented. Eighty national soccer teams, including all those which had qualified for the 1994 World Cup, had responded to the call and more teams were joining the campaign every week. Soccer players were uniquely qualified to speak on behalf of the poor, for soccer was the people's sport; many of its players and fans had been born into the very circumstances the global campaign was seeking to eradicate.

Every day, millions of people died as a result of poverty, the mismanagement of public affairs and misplaced priorities. Children could not be guaranteed a safe future in a world of injustice and suffering, where one in four people lived in poverty, where the gap between the poor and those who managed to survive was continually widening and where natural resources were not safeguarded. The situation was particularly shocking because it was well known that it would take only one generation to ensure that no child would go without an education, no human being would be denied either primary health care or safe drinking water and that no one would be condemned to go hungry.

There was no room for hollow words in the anti-poverty campaign or for resolutions that were adopted simply to be ignored. Ultimately, a high price would have to be paid for such cruel, undignified and stupid behaviour. In the immediate term, it might be tempting to "pay on credit", but that would be irresponsible towards future generations. He noted that military interventions, which Member States had witnessed and, at times, had even initiated, always had social causes. It was unthinkable to bequeath the world's children a future characterized by bloody conflict, insecurity in their lives and their jobs, and an environment that was largely destroyed.

In France, Germany, the United Kingdom and many other well-to-do countries, immigration was the major political issue of the day. Those countries could rest assured that nothing would stop the world's desperate poor from reaching their shores in order to escape abject poverty at home. It was therefore in the interest of the wealthier nations to provide intelligent, genuine assistance to those people in order to enable them to survive in their own countries. Soccer players understood the principle of solidarity, for soccer matches were won through teamwork. Individually, the States Members of the United Nations had the power to bring about change; united, they could banish poverty altogether and give hope to future generations. That could be achieved not through words but only through action.

In a world where the influence and the cost of arms remained considerable, there was no excuse for the absence of funds or of the political will necessary to guarantee every human being an education, safe drinking water, food and good health - in short, human dignity. Soccer players were speaking out because it had become urgent to do so. It was time to give priority to the anti-poverty campaign. The international community had covered important meetings to address the emergency situation. The world's best soccer players had become involved, in the hope that those meetings would not be lost opportunities but would constitute a genuine point of departure for the shaping of a better future. He recalled that, 20 years earlier, decisions had been taken concerning the quantity of assistance to be granted

to the poorest countries and that time-limits had been set. And yet, as of 1994, the world was not even half way towards reaching that goal. Of course, requesting aid from the wealthier countries was not the entire solution. The recipients of such aid must use it constructively in a common effort to achieve a better world for all.

Mr. DUGAN (United States of America) said that his country supported the efforts of the United Nations system to fight poverty and welcomed the people-centred development initiative of UNDP and the non-governmental organization Survie. In joining the global anti-poverty campaign, Mr. Bell and his colleagues sent a positive message to all, particularly the world's youth, and provided a very useful role model. The efforts by Mr. Bell and his colleagues reflected the spirit of General Assembly resolution 48/10, which proclaimed 1994 as the International Year of Sport and the Olympic Ideal. The resolution had been adopted under an agenda item entitled "Building a peaceful and better world through sport", which his delegation hoped would provide a context for further debate and action. On behalf of the host country of the World Cup tournament, he wished to thank Mr. Bell and his fellow-players from all over the world for the excitement and example of teamwork they had brought to the United States.

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION (continued) (A/49/204-E/1994/90, A/49/205-E/1994/91, E/1994/34, parts I, II and III, E/1994/35, E/1994/64 and Add.1 and 2, E/1994/84, E/1994/93)

The PRESIDENT said that, pursuant to Council decision 1994/218, the second day of the high-level meeting would be devoted to an informal dialogue with heads of agencies, funds and programmes.

Dr. SADIK (Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund) expressed appreciation for the Council's guidance concerning inter-agency coordination mechanisms. Those mechanisms would be fully exploited in implementing and monitoring the programme of action to be elaborated at the International Conference on Population and Development. Identifying which functions entities should perform individually (for example, advocacy, funding and financing, programme development, implementation, monitoring, research and

analysis, and norm-setting), and which functions should be performed jointly would help to clarify the division of labour. That would be particularly important in activities relating to cross-sectoral themes and issues, such as social sector development, sustainable human development, the empowerment of women, and population and development. Further consideration should be given to the concept of a 20:20 compact.

UNFPA had always taken a multisectoral and multidimensional approach to population issues and worked in close coordination with other United Nations organizations in the economic and social sectors. It would continue to build on the progress achieved since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 47/199 on the triennial policy review of operational activities for development within the United Nations system, particularly in its country strategy note (CSN), the harmonization of programme cycles, programme approach, national execution, national capacity-building and decentralization. It would also continue its close collaboration with United Nations partner agencies and organizations, its involvement in the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) and its work through the Joint Consultative Group on Policy (JCGP).

The recent annual session of the UNDP/UNFPA Executive Board had proved that the conversion of the former Governing Councils into Executive Boards had been a positive step. It had facilitated dialogue between the Secretariat and the Board and ensured broader participation by a wider range of delegations. UNFPA hoped that the welcome change in governance would result in increased funding of United Nations operational activities on a stable, predictable and assured basis. In looked forward to the debate at the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly on the financing of United Nations operational activities. In future, the modalities of financing such activities should reflect the principle of global partnership and the concept of fair burden-sharing. UNFPA hoped that the adoption of General Assembly resolution 47/199, and resolution 48/162 on further measures for the restructuring and revitalization of the United Nations in the economic, social and related

fields would help to resolve the problem of inadequate resources for operational activities. In conclusion, UNFPA hoped that the Economic and Social Council would support the recent decision taken by its Executive Board to observe the Fund's twenty-fifth anniversary at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session.

Mr. MACHIN (United Kingdom) noted that, although the field-level performance of agencies had improved, their evaluation mechanisms could not adequately measure performance output. He therefore wondered how the agencies could convince donors that their contributions were being effectively utilized.

Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Russian Federation) noted the shrinking budget of UNDP and the global reduction in the volume of resources available for economic development and operational activities. In those circumstances, he wondered how available resources could be used more efficiently. He wondered if the answer lay in the design of programmes that were easier to implement, the reduction of administrative costs, or harmonization and coordination, particularly at Headquarters.

Mr. BOEHMER (Germany) said that the country strategy note must become one of the most important management tools for designing programmes of assistance. It should form the basis for country programmes and should be discussed by the Executive Boards of the programmes and agencies during their consideration of country programmes. Perhaps country strategy notes should be updated periodically - or reviewed after an initial one-year period - to ensure that they were still relevant. The country strategy note should be consistent with and complement the policy framework paper submitted by many countries to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank.

He agreed with the representatives of the United Kingdom and Australia that the agency evaluation mechanisms must be strengthened both on an ex-post and current-performance basis. They must be a true measure of the impact of the various operational activities on development. A project portfolio performance review conducted on a country-by-country basis would be helpful in

that regard and also in assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each operation. The portfolio performance review should be used to determine future assistance programmes and the volume and content of assistance.

The 20:20 compact was an interesting idea but must not become another catchy slogan or it would be viewed as naive and simplistic. Well defined policy was far more important than quantitative targets. In general, he was wary of establishing too many quantitative targets, many of which seemed to be duplicating each other.

In conclusion, he was puzzled by the remark made by the representative of Pakistan the day before that neither donors nor agency Executive Boards should set priorities. His Government would find it difficult to provide funding for operational activities if priorities were not defined.

Mr. YAKER (Economic Commission for Africa) said that, from the point of view of the development of Africa, the link between emergency assistance and development must be accepted and made relevant through the proper allocation of resources. In the continuum between the national and regional dimensions of the issue, there was an apparent missing link between the resident coordinators in the field and Headquarters in New York, which probably lay in the regional dimension.

The situation in Africa was continuing to deteriorate despite the resources directed to the continent in recent years. An objective assessment of the state of Africa was needed in order to analyse trends in areas such as income, which had declined, and population, which had risen by some 3 per cent. He would welcome further information on how global security and sustainable development could be ensured if those trends were allowed to continue, and on how urgently needed programmes could be provided within the available resources.

Mr. GRANT (Executive Director, United Nations Children's Fund) said that evaluation and monitoring mechanisms did need improvement, and a major topic of discussion at the Joint Consultative Group on Programming (JCGP) had been the harmonization of methods among agencies. In order to

convince donors that progress was being made, it was essential to set clear goals. That was the purpose of the country strategy note. The national plans of action issuing from the World Summit for Children had resulted in goals to be achieved by 1995 and by 2000. Progress towards those goals was being monitored and, after the 1995 mid-term review, it would soon become clear how much had been achieved.

In reply to the representative of the Russian Federation, he said that efficiency could be increased in two ways: through better administration, involving cost reduction and better coordination, or through programming. Improved programming was the main purpose of the 20:20 proposal. Performance on the part of developing countries was, in fact, improving, although resources were running short. He agreed with the representative of Germany that additional resources would not necessarily solve all problems, but the developing countries had come closer to allocating 20 per cent of their budgets to human development priorities than the industrialized countries, which needed to respond to that progress. A critical lack of external resources could endanger the recent gains achieved.

Mrs. BERTINI (Executive Director, World Food Programme) said that a number of delegations had asked what the specialized agencies were doing to prove that their work was worth funding. For its part, the World Food Programme had undertaken a review of all its development work and had looked carefully at areas in which programmes could be strengthened, eliminated or expanded. An overall review of its development projects was available. About 20 per cent of its projects had met their objectives and had been discontinued; a number of others were not meeting expectations and had been terminated immediately. The Programme had also conducted a historical survey of its work. Outside experts had been asked for comments on their experience with its programmes over the years, and those comments had been useful in policy review. The Programme was also beginning the evaluation of emergency projects, such as its response to the drought in southern Africa. A new emphasis was being placed on results, so that successful projects could be

replicated in other situations. The Programme's internal evaluation service was being upgraded, and both internal and external expertise were being used. WFP was also conducted external evaluations, such as the tripartite evaluation recently conducted by Canada, the Netherlands and Norway, and others conducted by USAID and the European Community.

The role of the World Food Programme as a technical manager of programmes was to provide the most efficient assistance possible for people in need. Donor confidence in its work enhanced its ability to operate in the developing world.

In response to the question from Algeria, she said that 54 per cent of the resource target for the biennium had been reached thus far, as compared with 64 per cent for the same date in the previous biennium. With regard to the queries from Australia, about the links between JCGP and the specialized agencies, she said that relations could be improved between the resident coordinators and the technical agencies. The representative of Pakistan had asked if any benefits could result to donor Governments. The World Food Programme purchased food in many countries, including $200 million-worth of food from developing countries, and that could be attractive to donors.

Mr. SPETH (Administrator, United Nations Development Programme) said that UNDP had great problems with evaluation because of the breadth of activities. It had recently been asked whether its activities were indeed spread too thin and whether a greater sense of focus and mission and more accountability were needed. The Executive Board had just delivered a strong vote of confidence on that new focus, which would allow decentralization and a concentration of resources at the country level. In order to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation functions, he had placed them directly under the Office of the Administrator, which would also link them more closely to strategic planning. UNDP had also strengthened its annual review of its project portfolio and had more external peer review as well.

In response to the questions from the representative of the Russian Federation, conventional wisdom held that, as resources shrank, they would be

used more efficiently; therefore cutting resources was not necessarily bad. He did not believe that that always increased efficiency, however, as it produced more competition for resources, thus setting in motion responses and processes which were not related to service delivery.

He was pleased to note that the 20:20 concept was gaining support. Its main objective was to ensure that a larger share of resources went to meet the priority needs of the very poor.

The Human Development Report, 1994, although it had generated controversy, was important in that it counteracted the idea that economic growth was all that mattered by keeping human values in the forefront of the international debate. It had editorial independence, and its staff was drawn both from within and outside UNDP. He was reluctant to reduce its already modest budget allocation, since that would reduce the possibilities for staff outreach, consultation and review. The report had proven its value to the developing world and to donors, and the capability to produce it should be strengthened.

Mr. Botez (Romania) took the Chair.

Dr. SADIK (Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund) said that the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) had conducted an extensive review of its work over the past 20 years, evaluating both successful, and not so successful programmes on a country-by-country basis. As a result, UNFPA had refined its thematic programme approaches. In general, UNFPA assessed every project it undertook, selecting certain projects for independent external evaluation. UNFPA had conducted several thematic evaluations in order to sharpen its sectoral strategy in programme areas. Specifically, family planning services, adolescent and educational programmes and the programme on women, population and development had been extensively reviewed. Routine evaluations included tripartite and bipartite reviews for national execution projects, mid-term reviews for country programmes and end-of-programme reviews for selected programmes. UNFPA was actively contributing

to the country strategy note through its own programme review and strategy development exercise, which established a policy dialogue with Governments.

In reply to the representative of the Russian Federation, who had asked what could be done to increase funding of the specialized agencies and reduce administrative costs, she recalled that all the governing bodies of those agencies had participated in the support cost study. Further discussion was required in the Economic and Social Council on a proper division of labour and responsibilities to avoid unnecessary overlapping.

Mr. DESAI (Under-Secretary-General, Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development), addressing questions regarding the country strategy note, said that delegates should refer to the document entitled "Country Strategy Note", issued in March 1994, which provided guidance elements for the preparation, design and implementation of the CSN and dealt explicitly with the way in which the CSN provided the framework for the country programmes and with the monitoring and evaluation of the CSN. The link between the CSN and other coordinating documents was also discussed. In general, it should be remembered that the starting-point of the CSN was the willingness of a country to formulate such a note. He noted that 58 countries had expressed that willingness and it was expected that country strategy notes would be completed for 43 of those countries during 1994.

Mrs. VASISHT (India) said that it would be helpful if delegates were kept informed of the operationalization of a resolution as it occurred, and she asked specifically if gender principles had evolved for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 47/199. Secondly, she wondered whether the availability of national expertise in the area of country programme evaluation was being fully explored before outside monitoring agencies were employed. Thirdly, she enquired what mechanisms were used in the audit of indicative planning figures and other financial resources in country programmes and whether donor input was ever considered. Fourthly, she asked if steps were being taken to operationalize the 20:20 concept, commenting that it did not generate resources for developing countries.

Fifthly, she asked what progress had been achieved in the joint and co-sponsored programme on AIDS, specifically with regard to resource flows, and, lastly, she sought clarification concerning the meaning of the expression "peer review" and the extent of its scope.

Her delegation awaited with great interest the administrative report of the United Nations Development Programme to be submitted in 1995, and believed that the shift from quantitative to qualitative factors called for careful consideration, as the areas involved remained untested by a clear mandate. Her delegation's support for further funding would depend on the value and comprehensiveness of that administrative report. Lastly, she fully agreed with the representative of Pakistan that domestic prioritization depended solely on national Governments.

Mr. MARRERO (United States of America) said that his delegation was pleased with the cooperative spirit shown by agency heads in their efforts to strengthen the role of resident coordinators. He asked what steps agency heads were taking to ensure that those efforts filtered down to the lowest level of each agency, both in the field and at headquarters. Secondly, he asked what agencies were doing to address the fact that increasing demands were being made on the resident coordinators. Lastly, he suggested that each of the Executive Boards at their next meeting should discuss policy issues requiring the involvement of the Economic and Social Council and make recommendations for consideration at the next organizational meeting of the Council.

Mr. MUEGGE (United Nations Industrial Development Organization) said that his organization had done a complete review of its services, including screening, appraisal and evaluation of the development objectives of recipient countries and the quality and cost-efficiency of services. The major difficulty was in securing resources for reviews and programmes, rather than in conducting the activities themselves. Some member States had provided financial resources for UNIDO to carry out detailed investigations in the field; however, resources for larger programmes were dwindling. He proposed

increasing a combined, system-wide evaluation in recipient countries to assess the extent to which the United Nations system had been able to meet such objectives as poverty alleviation. It might also be useful to evaluate United Nations field representation and, eventually, the country strategy note.

Mr. KELLOWAY (Australia) said that bilateral donor and recipient countries alike had experienced extensive change over the past 20 years, resulting in an increasing demand for efficiency. Both recipients and donors in bilateral activities were seeking well designed projects, and those agencies which were most open to reform would be most likely to see an increase in resources. He asked agency heads to describe their administrative costs as a percentage of their programmes, and enquired whether they could provide a strategic planning document that set forth in clear terms their mandate, goals and objectives, the outcomes expected and the manner in which they were measured. That document should not be an annual report, nor a mid-term plan, which was frequently a compendium of anticipated activities.

Miss JANJUA (Pakistan) said that the comparative advantage of the United Nations in carrying out operational activities and providing assistance to developing countries was its flexibility and neutrality and the ability to provide such technical assistance to countries with varying types and levels of development. That flexibility and neutrality would be undermined if each governing body set firm priorities restricting its agency's activities. For instance, the former Governing Council of UNDP had adopted six broad themes for its fifth programming cycle, some of which were relevant for certain countries and not for others. Problems arose when there was forced universal application of all themes, regardless of the specificities of each individual country. Ultimately, it was for each developing country to determine which global themes were applicable to it. Donors could promote priority themes through their bilateral programmes, but once funding occurred through the multilateral system, neutrality had to be respected.

It should be borne in mind that funding through the United Nations programmes was of benefit to donors as well as recipients. While her

delegation appreciated the fact that donors had problems, in the current world climate, in selling the idea of funding for development assistance to their legislatures, it should not be forgotten that donors received benefits in the areas of employment and procurement, as the Executive Director of the World Food Programme had suggested. Her delegation would very much like to have statistics in those areas.

While evaluation was a valuable exercise, she felt that there were far too many evaluators; donor country after donor country evaluated an organization in an endless round, and there was no input from developing nations.

In response to the question raised by the United States representative concerning the proper forum for policy issues, it was her understanding that, according to the Economic and Social Council's new mandate, its operational activity segment was in fact the right forum for discussion of policy, while technical questions and issues specific to each programme were left to the individual Executive Boards.

Mr. Butler (Australia) resumed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT invited the representatives of the specialized agencies to respond to the questions that had been raised.

Mr. SPETH (Administrator, United Nations Development Programme), in response to a number of questions from the representative of India, said that there was indeed national involvement in the evaluation of country programmes. Mid-term reviews were very much joint recipient-Government/UNDP exercises. With regard to donor involvement in auditing indicative planning figures (IPF), there was no specific audit of IPFs, and donors were in no way involved in audits. Audits were handled solely by UNDP internal auditors and the United Nations Board of Auditors. As far as he was aware, no steps had yet been taken to operationalize the 20:20 concept. With regard to peer review of reports, UNDP's Executive Board resolution referred to both consultations and peer review, which were two different things. Peer review involved asking experts knowledgeable on subjects covered in human development

reports to provide an independent review, in a version of peer review analogous to that traditional with scholastic journals. Consultations, on the other hand, were held with Governments at various stages.

He had been pleased to hear the representative of Australia say that agencies that made themselves more efficient would receive additional resources. UNDP already had something analogous to the business plan that that representative had mentioned, but in stages.

He wished to assure the representative of Pakistan that her view of how global themes should be applied in practice coincided precisely with UNDP's own view.

In response to the concerns expressed by the United States representative, he wished to explain that the coordination assignment was indeed a substantial part of the resident coordinator's responsibilities, demanding anywhere from 25 to 75 per cent of his time. In his view, that merely underscored the importance of the institution. Coordination was essential to strengthening the network and achieving a more effective and unified United Nations system at the country level. UNDP did have a programme to strengthen the capacity of the resident coordinators. He would be happy to make available a document produced for a meeting of senior officials describing what steps they were taking.

Mr. GRANT (Executive Director, United Nations Children's Fund), in response to the questions raised by the representative of Pakistan, said that there was broad agreement that each country should set its own priorities, hence the country strategy note. But the world community did set some common goals, as it had done at the World Summit for Children with the participation of all countries, including Pakistan. Goals sometimes appeared to be imposed from the top down, but in order to eliminate problems such as guinea worm disease, iodine deficiency, AIDS and polio myelitis, a global effort was needed and had been agreed upon. Moreover, in any discussion of benefit to the donor, he felt that it was important to remember that the chief aim of assistance programmes was to help recipient countries.

Discussion of the 20:20 proposal was becoming stalled because of the absence of a definition of the concept, the tendency to confuse it with the larger issue of sustainable development and the fear that it would tend to restrict official development assistance. The 20:20 proposal said nothing about conditionality. He believed that, if the 20:20 goal were reached by donor countries, public support for development assistance would actually increase. Most people wanted their money to go towards helping others. He agreed, however, that more input did not automatically guarantee better results.

The definition of 20:20 human development priorities would certainly encompass basic health, basic education, family planning, water and sanitation. Obviously, that did not provide all the money needed to overcome poverty. It merely covered the basic services and did not touch on the problem of jcb creation. Other core expenditures would be needed for that purpose, and perhaps other targets would be set at the World Summit for Social Development in 1995. He wished to point out that, at the Dakar conference held in November 1992, 20:20 as a vision to work towards had been endorsed by 18 donor countries and 46 African countries. At the Cairo meeting of non-aligned countries, participants had endorsed what they had called the "20:20 Vision". There seemed to be a consensus on the direction in which to go, although the specifics remained to be worked out. He would say that in fact 20:20 had become operational in some countries. Some of the national plans of action had incorporated the goal of 20 per cent allocation to human development priorities.

Dr. SADIK (Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund) said that she wished to respond to four questions that had been raised. The representative of India had asked if UNFPA always used outside experts. On the contrary, a list of experts in each country was maintained, and national experts were always called upon first. In response to the question from the representative of the United States, she would say that the field staff was indeed overburdened and that the headquarters staff was also becoming

overburdened, with all the inputs and requests for reports from other agencies. On the subject of auditing, her answer was the same as that given by Mr. Speth. In response to the question asked by the representative of Japan the day before, UNFPA was experimenting with the decentralizing of authority to the field. Decentralization would be expanded to additional countries once accountability problems had been worked out. Some problems arose in trying to coordinate with other agencies that did not have the same degree of decentralization at the field level.

Mrs. BERTINI (Executive Director, World Food Programme) said that she wished to address five points that had been raised. With regard to administrative costs, in 1993 WFP had had total expenditures of $US 1.6 billion and overhead expenditures of $US 96 million, or 6 per cent. While WFP was somewhat proud of that figure, two studies, one internal and one external, had shown that actually not enough money was spent on monitoring, accounting and management to cover those areas adequately. A cost study done by an outside firm was available upon request. She did not believe that there were common standards among the United Nations agencies for describing overheads. WFP used its own system. In response to the Australian representative's ideas about a corporate strategy, she could point to a policy document of a prospective nature prepared for consideration by WFP's governing body. She would be glad to share it and obtain input from the Council members.

The United States representative had asked if the Economic and Social Council could have the benefit of recommendations from the agencies for its work in 1995. The agenda for WFP's forthcoming December meeting included a review of the input that should be provided to the Economic and Social Council next year. The thrust of the review was the implementation of resolutions 48/162 and 47/199 and the changes needed to accomplish it, but the scope of the review could be broadened if the Council so wished.

The United States representative had also asked what steps WFP was taking to make coordination a way of life. A memorandum of understanding had

been concluded between WFP and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), which she felt was a model for coordination. WFP had met with UNICEF to discuss coordination in emergency activities. WFP was moving towards the programme approach with expert assistance from UNDP/UNFPA. Once the transition to a programme approach had been completed, coordination with the other agencies would be facilitated. She could cite many further examples of coordination. Project ideas, for instance, were circulated to all members of the Joint Consultative Group on Policy (JCGP), and also to FAO and other technical agencies. When UNDP had its world-wide meeting, the other agencies were invited to participate. Coordination issues were a major topic of discussion at the WFP country directors' meeting. There were many joint training projects, such as the Turin programme. The JCGP 1994 meeting chaired by UNICEF was deliberately held in a developing country, Bangladesh, in order to emphasize coordination on development problems.

The PRESIDENT invited delegations to pose follow-up questions.

Mr. MARRERO (United States of America) thanked the Executive Director of UNICEF for clarifying his earlier question, which he believed the representative of Pakistan had misunderstood.

Mr. PEDROSO (Cuba) noted that there was a paradox. On the one hand there was a growing effort to decentralize development activities in the field. At the same time, coordination efforts were increasingly centralizing functions at headquarters and at the level of the resident coordinator.

Mr. KELLOWAY (Australia) said that he had received answers to his two questions regarding administrative costs and a corporate or strategic plan from some of the agencies but not from all. He would pursue those answers at a later time.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.